

REMARKS

By this Responsive Amendment, claims 14 and 16-18 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter claimed thereby, claims 1, 4-8, 10, 12, 26, and 29-36 have been amended, and new claim 37 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-13, 25, 26, and 28-37 are pending and are subject to examination in the above-captioned patent application. No new matter is added by the foregoing amendments, and these amendments are fully supported by the specification. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the above-captioned patent application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 25, 28, 30, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶1, as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one of ordinary skill in the art that Applicants were, at the time the application was filed, in possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that Applicants' specification merely discloses that a pseudo instruction is defined to be handled in the same manner as a NOP instruction by the execution unit 12, and does not disclose that the pseudo instruction is handled as a NOP instruction when the pseudo instruction is **detected**, as set forth in claims 25, 28, 30, and 32. See, e.g., Office Action, Page 3, Lines 1-4. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Specifically, Applicants' specification states that when the pseudo instruction is identified (detected), it is understood that the branch instruction follows the pseudo code, and further, the pseudo instruction is defined to be handled in the same manner as a NOP instruction by the instruction execution unit 12. Appl'n, Page 6, Lines 31-33; and

Page 7, Lines 1-3. As such, Applicants submit that Applicants' specification describes that the pseudo instruction is handled as a NOP instruction when the pseudo instruction is **detected**, as set forth in claims 25, 28, 30, and 32. Moreover, Applicants submit that those of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the pseudo instruction cannot be "handled" until the pseudo instruction first is detected or identified. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the enablement rejection of claims 25, 28, 30, and 32.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1, 2, 6-8, 16-18, 34, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,577,189 to Cocke *et al.* ("Cocke"). Moreover, the Examiner rejected claims 3-5, 9-14, 26, 29, 31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Cocke. Further, the Examiner rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being rendered obvious by Applicants' Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,872,978 to Hoskins *et al.* ("Hoskins"). To the extent that these rejections remain applicable in view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, as follows.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, 30-34, and 36 to describe that the present invention executes at least one instruction, e.g., a branch instruction, following a pseudo instruction without executing the pseudo instruction, thereby reducing processing time of the at least one instruction.

In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, Cocke describes dividing a branch instruction into a branch instruction and an exit instruction, and executing both the branch

instruction and the exit instruction, thereby requiring at least two cycles for executing an instruction. As such, Cocke does not disclose or suggest executing at least one instruction following a pseudo instruction without executing the pseudo instruction, as set forth in independent claims 1, 8, 30-34, and 36. Moreover, the Examiner does not allege that AAPA, Hoskins, or any other reference supplies these missing elements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1, 8, 30-34, and 36.

Claims 2-7, 9-13, 25-29, and 35 depend from one of allowable independent claims 1 and 8. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner also withdraw the rejection of claims 2-7, 9-13, 25-29, and 35.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submits that the above-captioned patent application is in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested. If the Examiner believes that an in-person or telephonic interview with Applicants' representatives will in any way expedite the examination of the above-captioned patent application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney of record. Applicants are including a petition for a three-month extension of time, and a check in the amount of \$950 covering the requisite large entity fee for such an extension of time, with this paper. A grant of that petition is earnestly solicited. Moreover, in the event of any variance between the fees determined the Applicants and those determined by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, please charge any such variance to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 01-2300.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox PLLC

By: 

Timothy J. Churna
Registration No. 48,340

Arent Fox PLLC
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-8933
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

CMM/TJC:kIf